



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,344	06/22/2001	Atsushi Tomita	AICA-24-US	8899

7590 05/09/2003
Davis & Bujold, P.L.L.C.
500 N. Commerical Street
4th Floor
Manchester, NH 03101

EXAMINER

SHORT, PATRICIA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1712

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/888344

Applicant(s)

Tomita et al

Examiner

Short

Group Art Unit

1712

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on March 25, 2003
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 5-14 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 5-14 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1712

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 7-10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Support for the styrene block copolymer having an average molecular weight (mw) or weight average molecular weight is not apparent. As originally disclosed and claimed the styrene block copolymer has a number average molecular weight (Mn). See the specification at page 6, lines 2-7 and original claims 1 and 3.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hansen. The rejection is applied as in the previous Office Action. As the language "consisting essentially of" excludes only components

Art Unit: 1712

that materially affect the novel and basic characteristics of the claimed invention, it is not clear that "consisting essentially of" excludes the tackifier of the reference. A tackifier is disclosed for use in the invention at page 11 of the specification. Examples 1 and 4, containing a tackifier, have a compression set of less than 90% and easy peelability. Thus, a tackifier does not appear to materially affect the novel and basic characteristics of the claimed invention. See *In re Janakirana-Rao* 137 USPQ 893 (1963). With respect to the block A compatible resin used to modify the polyphenylene ether of the reference, the modified polyphenylene ether of the invention is prepared by blending polyphenylene ether with another resin such as styrene resin and the like. See the specification at page 7. Finally, it is not clear how a hot melt sealing composition that is used to assemble parts distinguishes over a hot melt adhesive.

Claims 5-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO '396. The rejection is applied as in the previous Office Action. As the language "consisting essentially of" excludes only components that materially affect the novel and basic characteristics of the claimed invention, it is not clear that "consisting essentially of" excludes the tackifier of the reference. A tackifier is disclosed for use in the invention at page 11 of the specification. Examples 1 and 4, containing a tackifier, have a compression set of less than 90% and easy peelability. Thus, a tackifier does not appear to materially affect the novel and basic characteristics of the claimed invention. See *In re Janakirana-Rao* 137 USPQ 893 (1963). Further, it is not clear how a hot melt sealing composition that is used to assemble parts distinguishes over a hot melt adhesive.

Claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO '396. The rejection is applied as in the previous Office Action and maintained for reasons discussed above.

Art Unit: 1712

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

P. Short

May 8, 2003

Phone (703) 308-2395

Fax (703) 872-9311

PATRICIA A. SHORT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

